Abbé Taylor's

CONSIDERATIONS

UPON THE STATE OF

PUBLIC AFFAIRS,

IN THE YEAR M.DCC.XC.IX.

IRELAND.

BRITISH MUSEUM
17
53
SEP

16

CONSIDERATIONS

UPON THE STATE OF

PUBLIC AFFAIRS,

IN THE YEAR MDCCXCIX.

IRELAND.

K [Appendix. — Miscellaneous

"Omnem equidem terram, ſceptris quæ libera noſtris
"Diſſidet, externam reor, & ſic dicere divos." VIRG.

Dublin:

PRINTED BY W. PORTER, 69, GRAFTON-STREET,
AND W. JONES, NO. 26, COLLEGE-GREEN.

1799.

BRITISH MUSEUM
17
53
SEP

ADVERTISEMENT.

ABOUT the middle of laſt year, I had prepared for the preſs ſome reflexions upon the ſtate of Ireland, which at that time appeared to me very little known, or very ill underſtood in the public of this country.

Upon the firſt intimation of the project of a LEGISLATIVE UNION, I pauſed upon this deſign, the utility of which became in a conſiderable degree ſuperſeded by it; and I turned my attention in ſilence to the progreſs and ſucceſs of that great meaſure, to which it was impoſſible not to foreſee ſome of the principal obſtacles and motives of oppoſition. But it is but very lately that I perceived any advantage in a public diſcuſſion of them, in the particular light in which they preſented themſelves to my view.

The

The peculiar manner in which the offer of Union on the part of Great Britain has been received by the Houſe of Commons in Ireland, and the delicacy that conſtantly occurs in a free examination of the ſubject upon this ſide of the water, have determined me to make public the following Conſiderations. The truth of them, I flatter myſelf, will be felt where it is moſt uſeful: though, perhaps, under the preſent circumſtances, it could not ſo properly or ſo ſtrongly be inſiſted upon in any public or reſponſible quarter, as from the calm and privacy of the cloſet.

CON-

CONSIDERATIONS, &c.

WHEN the great queſtion, which is the ſubject of the preſent Conſiderations, was firſt whiſpered in the world, it ſeemed to ſtrike upon the minds of men with a peculiar mixture of anxiety and delight, till it ſubſided for a time in a general ſuſpence and aſtoniſhment.

But this ſituation of the public ſentiment did not ariſe, as I apprehend, from the novelty or the magnitude of the meaſure, nor from any preſumption of a juſt oppoſition or rational diſlike on the part of Ireland, to ſo happy and ſo glorious a termination as it held out to her crimes, her ſufferings, and her dangers.

The conſtant and earneſt declarations of the moſt oſtenſible perſons in that kingdom, of the perſons higheſt in ſituation and higheſt in popularity, entirely forbade and excluded that apprehenſion. They had loudly and repeatedly announced, "That things could not remain upon their preſent eſtabliſhment; that commercial jealouſy was rouſed; that

that it would increaſe with two independant Legiſlatures; that the ſeeds of ſeparation were ſown in the final ſettlement of 1782; that ſeparation of intereſt would bring on ſeparation of CONNEXION." The public opinion had kept in even tenor with the warnings of Iriſh ſtateſmen, and the ſenſe of practical evils, the dreadful courſe and career of calamities which every poſt divulged, and which advanced and expanded with progreſſive force and ſwiftneſs, till they bore off happineſs, and peace, and virtue, from that devoted land, had prepared the public for any meaſure of vigour and authority, as they had legitimated every act of vigilance and power.

Still leſs could the novelty of the propoſal have excited ſurpriſe. It had been ſpecifically recommended, in times comparatively fortunate, by the ableſt ſtateſmen, and political authorities, upon both ſides of the water: and in one period of her hiſtory it had been ſolicited by Ireland herſelf. But it was the peculiar character and quality of the remedy, compared with the exceſs and virulence of the evil; it was the novelty, not of the thing, but of the circumſtances to which it was adapted, and the greatneſs, not of the meaſure, but of the mind which dictated it, that created ſuſpence and aſtoniſhment.

That the local miſ-government or misfortunes of Ireland, ſhould, inſtead of forfeitures and penalties, be made to operate to her advantage and glory; that inſtead of a perpetual military government, and a trembling dependance upon the crown

of

of England for a daily and precarious exiſtence, the parliament of Dublin ſhould be courted to take its ſeat in the capital of the Empire, and mix and blend with the general repreſentation; that the Catholic ſhould be invited to a gradual participation of civil and political equality, and this in the midſt of the crimes of one and the weakneſs of the other, was juſtly entitled to admiration and applauſe —but that which tranſcendently filled and delighted the mind of every good and honorable perſon, was the dignified and conſcious purity of the policy of Great Britain, oppoſed to the perfidious practice and immorality of her enemies. After ſo many years of a war, in which they had reſpected no right, no law, nor principle of humanity; in which the repoſe and virtues, the enjoyments and endearments of ſocial life were the objects of hoſtility, and ſucceſs but a new and advanced point of attack: in which ſhe had ſeen her people expoſed to every artifice of cool and cruel malignity; debauched, miſled, perverted; diſciplined in revolts, and familiariſed with maſſacres: after ſhe had ſeen her ſtate, during ſeven years, aſſailed and mined by force and fraud, and the balance of Europe overthrown by violence and treachery; What was the meaſure of her retaliation and revenge? What was her ambition, and where did ſhe ſeek her relative aggrandizement? She turned her eyes not to conqueſts and equivalents, but to internal improvement, to the diſcovery and advancement of her own means and reſources, to the amelioration of her own condition,

tion, to the unity and conſolidation of her own ſtrength, to her own defence, proſperity, and power. In the midſt of warfare ſhe cultivated the arts of peace; ſhe repaired her own errors, recalled her people from ſeductions, and brought her diſtant provinces under a nearer influence and inſpection; ſhe extended her arms to every part of her dominions, and preſſed her extremeſt dependencies to her boſom, while ſhe girt the mighty Whole together in one compreſſing chain, one common bond of intereſt, affection, and ſecurity.

Behold her equivalent! contemplate this augmentation of her power and greatneſs! examine her policy! probe her ambition to the quick!—mark if ſhe writhes or ſhrinks, if there be any tumour, or any foulneſs there! while the pretended deliverers of mankind prolong their polluted reign, and found their diſaſtrous hopes in the wounds and corruptions of humanity, in the diſeaſe and diſſolution of ſociety itſelf!

When men could withdraw their eyes from this object of honeſt exultation; and had turned their thoughts to the critical and diſpaſſionate diſcuſſion of the ſubject itſelf, it ſeemed that the great meaſure of an incorporate Union between the two countries had naturally reſolved itſelf on the firſt aſpect into theſe important queſtions, by the ſolution of which, its fate would be decided—'Whether the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland were competent to treat for their conſtituents?' and 'whether the treaty propoſed, were beneficial to the contracting parties?' But it appears to have been conſidered by the

the Houſe of Commons in Ireland in another and a very different point of view beſides that of its utility, and this of their own competency and right to decide it. In that aſſembly, it did not lie between the advantages and relative intereſts of the two countries in the Union, which ſeemed virtually to be acknowledged, but it was ſuppoſed to contain ſomething humiliating to the pride and dignity of Ireland.—It was not conſidered as an injury which England deſigned, but an inſult which ſhe offered to a great and independent nation. With that feeling the Houſe very naturally refuſed to entertain it for a moment. With a juſt and becoming ſpirit they rejected the diſcuſſion at once; though by a meaſure ſo precipitate and unuſual, they doubtleſs incurred ſome imputation of diſreſpect to the crown, and of ingratitude to the parent-country.

It is neceſſary that this point ſhould be clearly and diſtinctly underſtood; and neceſſary to aſcertain whether the feelings of the Houſe of Commons were as juſt and proper as their conduct undoubtedly was while they were governed by them. For it would be ungenerous to ſuſpect of that Aſſembly, that they would have rejected with ſcorn, and refuſed to diſcuſs altogether, a great national meaſure recommended by their ſovereign, unleſs they had thought it on the one hand to imply ſome inſult and degradation to the nation they repreſent, and on the other to be ſo evidently advantageous to it, in an intereſted point of view, as to expoſe the people to the temptation and danger of overlooking the affront in the utility of

the offer. Upon any other ſuppoſition it is impoſſible to account for ſo wide a departure from the eſtabliſhed rules and practice of a deliberating Aſſembly as the moving a previous queſtion upon a meſſage from the throne, and ſhutting the diſcuſſion *in limine* upon a ſubject of the very higheſt moment that ever came before them. For to take it the other way: if the offer was ſuppoſed to be diſadvantageous to Ireland, or unpopular to a great extent in the country, then it would have come certainly to be rejected upon diſcloſure and diſcuſſion; and that, with the double infamy and ſtigma deſerved both by the affront and the injury; and the Houſe of Commons of Ireland could have had no motive for depriving the Britiſh miniſter of the full maſs of mortification that awaited him.

In that manner the ſame Aſſembly had acted in 1785 upon the occaſion of the commercial propoſitions. They ſaid that England ſold them commerce for conſtitution, and bartered her trade for their independence.——This meaſure, therefore, after full and long debates, and minute inveſtigation and publicity, they refuſed with ſcorn, to the confuſion and diſappointment of its projector. But upon the preſent propoſition they were not ſo ſure of the ſenſe and high ſpirit of the public.—They were fearful leſt the benefits propoſed by the Union ſhould extinguiſh all ſenſe of the affront, and they wiſely and honeſtly withheld the temptation from the people. I cannot but applaud the ſpirit and prudence of the Houſe as one who would never

never expoſe the people to ſuch a danger and temptation: as one who would not put it in their power to decide amiſs, nor comply with them if they did: as one who thinks the obſequiouſneſs of a government towards their fugitive and miſtaken will, a ſpecies of the very worſt cowardice and treaſon, and the will of the people no excuſe for the compliance of a government in any diſaſtrous, or diſhonourable, or dangerous meaſure.

But while I applaud the conduct of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons under the impreſſions which governed them, I entertain very conſiderable doubts whether thoſe impreſſions were natural and juſt; and I think it very important to aſcertain that point, becauſe it is from that alone, that it is poſſible to combine or foreſee the fate of the propoſal. If theſe impreſſions were founded in right reaſon, there is no doubt but that that Aſſembly will perſevere in the courſe they have taken; but if they were the momentary effects of warmth and national irritability, we may expect from their good ſenſe and their virtue, ſuch a temperament, as will at leaſt admit the diſcuſſion, and collect the public ſentiment with regard to it.

It ſeems to me in the firſt place, that ſome of the prejudices which exiſt in Ireland againſt the incorporation, are real and honeſt prejudices; and that we may have contributed to create them ourſelves by fatal gifts, and flattering appellations.—Whoever has attended to the courſe of public affairs, and public opinion, muſt have found occaſion to remark the influence of a word or a

phraſe upon the minds of men ; and if we had from miſtaken tenderneſs to Ireland permitted lofty or endearing ſounds to charm her ear from the true knowledge of her ſtate, we ſhould doubtleſs partake whatever blame were due to the deluſion. If we had granted independence to the moſt wretched, ill-governed, and dependant colony upon the ſurface of the globe ; if we had dignified with the name of Siſter-kingdom a ſettlement of Engliſh who had neither ſubdued nor gained the country they inhabited : nor won by arms, nor tamed by wiſdom and generoſity, the barbarous natives of the ſoil ; ſhould we be totally exempt from the folly or the fault of the planter whoſe ideas we had bewildered and confuſed ? It is impoſſible without pity for the human mind, to conſider the abuſe of words and the miſchiefs that reſult from it. From this perverſion and uncertainty, ſometimes weak, and ſometimes malicious, flow, as from their ſource, thoſe horrors which appear more glaring from their folly : and crimes, whoſe worſt and moſt atrocious character is their mixture of abſurdity and guilt. While we have laviſhed theſe ſeducing names upon our colony, and ſoothed her into the fond belief of imperial greatneſs and equality, what are the kind and grateful epithets, what the fond and endearing blandiſhments ſhe pays us in return ? The Siſter-kingdom calls us " Foreigners," and the independant ſtate makes a mighty merit of her preference for " Britiſh connexion." Foreigners and Connexion !

Connexion ! But we deſerve no better, for we began the folly, and are the firſt deceivers. Foreigners and Connexion ! Are we not their parent ? Are they not our own blood ? Are they not governed by our laws ? Are they not defended by our ſword ? Are they not maintained in their power, in their religion, in their conſtitution, in their lands, by the protecting arm and parental vigilance of England ?

To ſuch an extent of prejudice does this fatal ambiguity or perverſion of terms prevail in whatever regards this deluded colony, that it is become impoſſible (unleſs we are merely ſpeaking geographically) to know what is meant by the word Ireland itſelf. We have occaſion for explanation or definitions at every turn.——Sometimes it is the great majority of the people, ſometimes it is the ſettler ; now it is the great population of the natives in arms, and now the independent colony trembling at its diſparity ; here it is the repreſentative of a handful of proteſtants ; there the directory, and the catholic republic. Out of this confuſion it is indiſpenſable to collect ſome order, and to be able to convey and expreſs our meaning in diſtinct and poſitive language. I am unwilling to give offence any where, and am far from intending it ; but I do not expect to probe theſe long and ulcerous ſores without giving pain ; if I could, the gangrene has taken place, and there is no remedy but amputation.

It is painful, no doubt, to withdraw the eye from theſe ambitious dreams of federal crowns and

and independent ſenates, to ſend back through the ivory portal theſe flattering images of power and greatneſs, and preſent the bloody and diſguſting mirror of realities. But is it my fault if the Britiſh colony in Ireland cannot read its ſtate, or recollect its origin, or perceive its dangers?—Am I to blame, if it ſleeps on the brink of ruin, or for awakening it?

Would God we lived in times when we might ſlumber on in delightful or tranquil viſions, when we might rock ourſelves to reſt with innocent flatteries and deluſions!——We have been rouſed with a mighty peal, and have armed by the flaſhes of contiguous conflagrations. But if we cannot ſee the avenging power that overturns our gates, and the trident that ſhakes our foundations, we ſhall neither ſave our religion, nor our parents, nor our children; and exchange at beſt our deſtiny for an unprofitable and inglorious revenge!

The hiſtory of the Iriſh nation begins with the conqueſt of Ireland. All that precedes is falſe, or doubtful, obſcure or utterly unknown, a proverbial fable, forged to inſult the ſenſe and outrage the credulity of mankind. All uſeful knowledge of it is coeval with Engliſh "connexion." It is true this connexion was parentage with the colony and conqueſt with the natives. Hence followed a double duty, of which it is to be for ever lamented that we have not acquitted ourſelves with equal juſtice; for conqueſt brings duties with it as well as colonization. We owed protection and encouragement to our ſettler, but inſtruction

and

and the gradual amelioration of his condition to the native. Such in the beginning, after Henry the Second accepted the perjurable fealty of Ireland, and received the whole iſland into homage as a fief of his crown, was the pious policy of the time. The converſion of her barbarous hordes to chriſtianity, the reſtriction and ſubordination of her ſavage ariſtocracy of Sheiks and Beys, were the benefits that great prince conferred upon the Iriſh. If in ſucceſſive periods the progreſs of civilization has not kept pace with the advancement of the parent country, I think it more eſpecially to be attributed to the great impolicy of Henry the Eighth at the reformation, when the feuds of religious difference became ſuperadded to the inextinguiſhable quarrel, and rendered the ſtate of the conquered and the ſettler more hoſtile and rancorous than in the moment of uſurpation. If the ſovereigns between him and his great predeceſſor are juſtly chargeable with omiſſion in neglecting the civilization or incorporation of the natives, the colony itſelf from that time is to be accuſed of that excluſive and ungenerous policy, which has depreſſed and degraded the human character itſelf in the form of the native Iriſh; and if England is to be condemned, as ſhe juſtly may be, it is for her criminal indulgence to her colony, and her inactivity and inattention to the natives who were entitled to her protection.

But it is the more to be lamented that the crown of England ſhould have omitted to accompliſh or attempt the incorporation of Ireland before

fore or at the period of the reformation; becauſe by that event it became in a great meaſure impoſſible for the Britiſh colony itſelf to effect any thing favourable to the native, or to work with ſincerity for his improvement, and the advancement of his condition. They were placed at a wider diſtance; new barriers had ſprung up between them; and while the ſee of Rome, which had granted Ireland to a pious prince, never ceaſed to conteſt it with his heretic ſucceſſors, the colony had new dangers to provide againſt, or new injuries to revenge.

I am not preparing to ſhew the progreſs of theſe natural and religious diſſenſions, too legible in the worſt pages of our hiſtory, but it is an object of the greateſt conſequence to conſider it with unbiaſſed meditation, in order to determine this important queſtion with fidelity and preciſion, "Whether it be poſſible for the Britiſh colony to ameliorate the condition of the natives?" James the Firſt ſeems, of all our princes, to be entitled to commendation for his ſalutary efforts in that amiable work, but the liberality of ſucceeding times has been conſtantly overpowered and defeated by the obſtacles I have here related.

It is certainly a matter very little to our honour in any point of view, that after a period of ſix hundred years ſo little progreſs ſhould have been made in the conciliation of the minds of the Iriſh, in the amelioration of their condition, or in their fuſion and intermixture with the colony. It cannot be without our own fault and reproach, that we have

have not effectually interfered in their favour, and compelled our plantation to a more juſt and enlightened policy with regard to them; and the accumulated rancour of ſo many centuries, now burſt at laſt upon their heads, will be a dreadful caution to other conquerors how long they retain theſe odious diſtinctions, and defer the complete union and incorporation of their acquiſitions.

It is the practice of our enemies to reproach this country with every evil and every accident that has ever befallen Ireland. But if ever their accuſations had been juſt, or they had ſought for any truth or any argument to ſupport them, they would have reproached us for our long delay, protraction, and omiſſion, of this very meaſure of Union which we are now accuſed by ſome of our coloniſts of preſenting premature and untimely to their independent parliament; it is our cruel indifference to the inſtruction and well-being of the native, and our obſequious tenderneſs to the ſettler; it is, that the "final ſettlement" of Ireland has been deferred through ſo many reigns; that we are *now* attempting that which ought to have been perfected by every prince, at leaſt ſince the Reformation. It is that we have not incorporated; that we have not done our duty by the ſubjects we acquired; that we have ſuffered them to preſerve the memory of an original wrong, and to remain in a ſtate of ignorance, rudeneſs and barbariſm, worſe in its effects, and more degrading in its nature, than that in which our fathers found them ſix centuries before.

If we look to any part of the continent which has been conquered, inherited, or acquired by any other ſtate, we ſhall not find the ſame impolicy, and I muſt add, the ſame cruelty as our own; for though I will never vindicate or adviſe meaſures of violence and injuſtice, I have no ſcruple to ſay that there is no violence more cruel than neglect, and no injuſtice equal to the cold continuance of the miſeries we found. Not that the meaſures we have purſued in Ireland have been always free from active violence and exceſſes; both Cromwell and William the Third made cruel retaliations upon the rebellious native, and exacted grievous forfeitures and confiſcations. If we were reproached for theſe deeds of theirs by the catholic and the attainted only, I would not complain of our accuſer, I would aſk alone if a century of kindneſs cannot efface our fathers' ſeverity? But when the grantees of Cromwell and the king, when the children of their ſoldiers, and the heirs of their rapacity reproach us with their own gains, when they accuſe us of their own crime, and array the ſpoil and plunder they have ſeized, amongſt the articles of our impeachment, I know not, I confeſs, with what temper to anſwer them, whether with ſcorn or argument: nor whether their groſs abſurdity proceeds from the confuſion of their own underſtandings, or their contempt for ours! But let the crimes of centuries be blazoned out; let the annals of rancour and revenge be ranſacked, and the avarice and cruelty of theſe conquerors be dreſſed in all the colours of popular exaggeration, ſtill I think their crime of omiſſion was greater than their

crime

crime of commiſſion, and their cruelty in not uniting Ireland worſe than their cruelty of confiſcation. Cromwell, it is well known, would have united Holland, ſo that the policy could not have been unknown to him; and William had that occaſion and opportunity which have recurred after an hundred years, with the ſame crimes, and wickeder rebellions. Another century has found the ſame feuds, the ſame maſſacres, the ſame untamed ferocity, the ſame unreclaimed barbarity in the Iriſh people; and it has fortunately found the ſame power and fortune of the Britiſh arms defending their conqueſt, and maintaining their colony. What is the reſult of all this experience, what the wiſdom we may learn in this dreadful ſchool?

Shall we ſuffer theſe evils to remain, and thrive, and ſpring up again? or lay the axe to the vivacious root which we have lopped ſo often, and to ſo little purpoſe? Shall we profit by the cruel leſſons of adverſity, or perſevere in this career of evils to new maſſacres and imperiſhable rebellions? Shall we perform that which we condemn every ſovereign and every adminiſtration for neglecting, or imitate their neglect in ſpite of our condemnation, and in ſpite of the unutterable calamities that ſtream from it?

That the native Iriſh ſhould retain their hoſtility, appears to me, I confeſs, under the circumſtances I have ſet down, more unwiſe than unnatural. That, remaining in the ſtate almoſt of their barbarous anceſtors, they ſhould retain their paſſions, and commit their exceſſes;—that they ſhould remember injuries

ries which have never been effaced, and make continual claim upon lands from which they have been diſpoſſeſſed by uſurpers who have extinguiſhed their crime by no benefits, no aſſimilation, no adoption—that they ſhould complain of non-reſident landlords, and a chain of leaſes between the owner and the tenant of the ſoil;—that they ſhould repine at paying taxes to a colony they hate, and tithes to a clergy they abhor—and finally, that ſore with real wrongs, and intoxicated with viſions of liberty; deceived by foreign gold, and the artifices of domeſtic treaſon, they ſhould be goaded or guided into rebellion—I confeſs it appears to me both as natural and as imprudent as the empire of the paſſions uſually is found to be. But when I hear the colony itſelf complain of our yoke, and accuſe us of oppreſſions—when I hear the very perſons guilty of all theſe wrongs, or for whoſe ſake they have been perpetrated, impeach us of their own crimes, and of our connivance, I proteſt I am at a loſs whether to attribute it to the ſuppoſed confuſion of their ideas, or to the perverſity of their heart. I have more indulgence for the catholic conſpirator, than for the proteſtant complaint; his principle is to be traced in the heart of man, and his motives lie deep in the very nature of his being. I know not of any calamity or danger that has reached or threatened England, where his conduct has not been uniform and direct. Has there been a diſputed title, a pretender to the crown, a pſeudo-prince, or a rebellion? he has joined them all, as ſo many occaſions to aſſert his right, and ſhake off the tyranny of England. He is the ally

of

of Perkin Warbeck, and of James the Second.—From Henry the Seventh to the king's illneſs, he has watched his opportunity of emancipation and revenge. It is *now* only that his conduct is become abſurd, when England offers Union, and as the conſequence of it, emancipation: now that ſhe has at length adopted that liberal and enlightened policy which will place him upon the ſame footing as her colony, and admit him to the full participation of the bleſſings of her imperial, free, and equal conſtitution. It is wiſer, indeed, to become a Briton, than to nouriſh an eternal and unprofitable hoſtility. It is wiſer to be admitted into the ſovereignty, than to make war upon it. To unite, is wiſer than to tear open early wounds, and perſevere in interminable quarrels.

But if he prefers the dictates of his paſſions; if he is the dupe of prieſts, of foreigners, of political reformers, of parties and promiſers; if it requires ſtill other leſſons of calamity and freſh ablutions of blood to efface theſe revengeful hopes, and prepare a happier and more pious choice, I commiſerate his error, and feel indulgence for the powerful movement of his ſoul; I cheriſh, too, the flattering hope that it is the laſt conteſt, and that the iſſue of it will effect this very Union, the neceſſity of which it will eſtabliſh, though too late for his own happineſs and the preſent ſalvation of his country.

From this miſerable and preponderant part of Ireland, I turn to that portion of it deſcended from our own loins, and nouriſhed with our own blood and treaſure: to that portion which is enthroned upon

upon the necks of the great population of the country, and upheld in its dangerous pre-eminence by the power of the parent ſtate;—to that portion, our own grantees and coloniſts, who have forgotten their birth, and denied their name; who diſown the hand that enfeoffed them, and ſtill guards their title; which planted them on the ſoil, and maintains them there; which gave them power, and now gives them impunity. I turn to that portion of Ireland which muſt ſtand or fall with us in ſpite of its dreams of independence, which is UNITED in ſpite of forms, and identified in defiance of parchments; which if our arm be withdrawn but a moment, will be trampled into the ground it uſurps, and which thinks it an indignity to be incorporated into our ſtate, and admitted to our empire.

We have read of a plant, the produce of I know not what fabulous Iſland, the property of whoſe fruit it was to take away all memory of the native country, all gratitude, regret and deſire of it. But though our colony ſhould have fed on it to fullneſs, I think they might trace their origin in the hatred and antipathy of the natives, in their own ſufferings and dangers. I think they might read it in characters of their own blood, and by the light of their own conflagrations. I think the ſavage who tortures their cattle, who cuts down their woods, who beſieges their houſes, who waylays their ſteward and their proctor, who aſſaſſinates their witneſſes and their magiſtrates; I think he tells them at every ſtep that they are ENGLISH—I think the peaſant who brings his writ of right in arms againſt their property, tells them

them they are ENGLISH—I think in every crime, and every calamity, they are forbidden to forget that they are ENGLISH.

Had our colony been proſperous and ſecure—had it grown and flouriſhed under our ſhade till it were capable of empire and independance—could Mr. Foſter or Mr. Grattan tell us that 'the natives are 'ſubdued by their kindneſs, and delighted with 'their yoke; that the whole country is united and 'incorporated within itſelf!—Could they ſay, we 'are in fact independant of you and all the world '—we are independant of all farther ſupport and 'aſſiſtance from you, we dread no rebellion, we 'fear no army of 'avengers,' we rule in peace, we 'reſide upon our lands, where we bleſs and inſtruct 'our faithful tenantry; we watch their education, 'we diſpel their ignorance, we command their af-'fections by the benefits we confer—to your armed 'empire we have ſubſtituted the reign of gratitude; 'our ſtate is adult and firm; we exiſt by our own 'induſtry, by our own means and efforts, and re-'quire no future aid or interference—why do you 'come to interrupt our tranquillity? to break our 'repoſe, to diſturb our perfect happineſs? have we 'invoked your aſſiſtance? have we called out to 'you? have we confeſſed any weakneſs or diſorder 'in our ſtate? have the natives revolted? are we 'invaded by foreigners?"—Had this been the caſe, and I could have heard a language like this, I have not ſo read the leſſon of America that I ſhould now be aſtoniſhed or affected by them: I have not ſo ſtudied the hiſtory of ungrateful proſperity, that I

ſhould

ſhould now be ſurpriſed at the power of the example and the repetition of the crime. But that the ſtern rugged nurſe ſhould breathe the ſame poiſonous counſels as the painted bawd; that wholſome Adverſity and flattering Success ſhould give the ſame treacherous advice,—I confeſs it confounds the very faculties and uſes of the mind.

Had our Iriſh colony been as happy and proſperous as our American—had ſhe enjoyed the ſame good fortune, and become as capable of independence, I ſtill do not ſee that with the experience of that event, it would have been wiſe and deſirable for her to have travelled in the ſame ſteps; and I think it very material to dwell a little upon this obſervation, becauſe there can be no manner of doubt but that this ſingle act of national ingratitude, has proved the ſignal of the diſſolution of the civilized world, that it has ſhaken every ſtate and every form of government to its centre, and looſened the foundations of ſociety itſelf. Unhappy England! There was no Cordelia amongſt all her daughters; Regan turned her from the door to the rude pelting of the pitileſs ſtorm, and Gonerill denies her hundred knights.

But it is not England that it is neceſſary to conſider; ſhe has triumphed, hitherto, over all her enemies and all her traitors, and over the worſt of all her thankleſs children. When I look to America, I diſtinguiſh the crime but not its utility; I ſee every thing but the profit of ingratitude. Is ſhe happier, or greater, ſince ſhe ceaſed to be a part of Britain? Are her taxes lighter? Is her commerce

protected

protected better? Is her government more reſpected or ſecure? While ſhe belonged to England, what ſtranger dared oppreſs her? Who plundered her merchants, or inſulted her flag, or ſuborned her people? What Frenchman dictated to her councils? What impoſitions did ſhe lay upon her land? What diſunion—what diſſolution threatened her? Did ſhe live or linger then by the care of a declining hand? Did the frail tenure of an old man's life ſuſtain and compreſs her provinces together? Did ſhe hold the empire not by her ſtrength, but the approach of her weakneſs, and the expectation of a better opportunity to divide and diſmember her? —Oh, but ſhe is independent! ſhe enjoys the ſovereign rights and ſupreme arbitrement of empire; ſhe ſends ambaſſadors; ſhe levies armies; ſhe prepares fleets; and decides on peace and war. For theſe advantages, he is a feeble ſtateſman indeed, who will not pardon a little ambition, and a little ingratitude.—Prove then that theſe are advantages. I ſee her ambaſſadors inſulted or unheard, expelled or ranſomed; I ſee taxes raiſed to pay forces, but they are to contain her own revolts: to defeat, not the armies, but the plots of foreigners. I ſee fleets, but ſhe dares not employ them. I ſee taxes and arms, but neither war nor peace. I ſee treaties, but it is with England, whom ſhe abandoned and abjured. I ſee that tutelary alliance, that maternal flag, protect the commerce for which America ſacrificed every moral duty, and ſo many political advantages. I ſee this cruel parent, whom ſhe deſerted and be-

 trayed,

trayed, maintain her among the nations, and uphold her periſhable ſtate amidſt the factions that prey upon her vitals.

America, however, had driven her ſavages behind her frontiers; ſhe had conquered and repelled the wild barbarian whom ſhe could not civilize. By the impolitic peace of 1763, we had delivered her from the neighbourhood and hoſtility of France, and ſhe demanded to be foris-familiated, like a proſperous child whoſe fortune has corrupted his heart. Has our ſettlement in Ireland even this excuſe? Is there any thing in common between the ſtate of theſe two colonies? In Ireland, the native prowls unconquered and untamed, confined with no pale, and forced behind no barrier—France is at her door and in her chamber—and while ſhe bellows "independence," ſhe is the prey of miſeries unknown and unheard of by the reſt of men; of crimes, for which the names are uninvented, of which the knowlege muſt be buried in dark eternal ſilence, where no ſound is heard, nor eye may penetrate, ſealed by diſguſt and horror, and guarded by the wounded dignity of humanity itſelf!

America, as it appears to me, I own, was happy and reſpectable, was fortunate and ſecure, when ſhe began her crime, and affected her independance. Her independance too was real and effectual. It was perfect in all its parts; ſhe abjured our crown as well as our legiſlature, and ſhe became a ſovereign by her ingratitude. Yet if I look at this ſovereign ſtate, and all her dangers and diviſions—if I contemplate

template the peculiar evils of her conſtitution, admired I think by none of the wiſe and provident, and commended only by the ſpeculiſt and the jacobin as examples of revolution and impunity: if I conſider her preſent ſtate, and the circumſtances upon which ſhe advances, I am ſcarcely to be reſtrained from affirming that there is nothing but union—this very meaſure of union and incorporation, of all her Provinces—that can ſave and defend her: or extricate her from the dangers and perplexities of that federal independence, which has neither defended Holland, nor Switzerland, nor the empire of Germany.

From the caſe of America, who has ſeparated, we are naturally led to that of Scotland, who has united herſelf with England; and I confeſs it appears to me not a little ſingular, that I ſhould have been ſo little anticipated upon one of the great and leading points of that argument; which does not appear to me to be half ſo intereſting, nor half ſo powerful from analogy as from contraſt. The analogy extends no farther than the probable conſequences of a parallel experiment—but the contraſt compriſes the whole general circumſtance and poſition of the two countries previous to the experiment; and the inference follows with accumulated and, I think, irreſiſtible force, in favour of the preſent meaſure; ſince experience has ſhewn, that under circumſtances of ſo unpromiſing a difference, that Union has ſtill proved fortunate, and ſurpaſſed the moſt ſanguine predictions of the great ſtateſmen, who were the authors of it. In the Scottiſh union, I am at a loſs to diſ-

cover any circumſtances of reſemblance to the preſent meaſure, beſides the accidental union of the two crowns upon the ſame head. Was Scotland a colony of ours? Was Scotland planted and watered by our hand? Had it grown and flouriſhed under our protecting ſhade? Was the property of Scotland in the hands of Engliſhmen? Was the parliament elected by Engliſhmen, and compoſed of Engliſhmen to the excluſion of the antient occupants of the ſoil? Had the laws, the religion, the conſtitution, and the language, and the ſtate, been tranſported thither from this parent country? From the firſt union of the crowns to the beginning of Queen Anne's reign, the legiſlative union had been a ſubject of deep deliberation. Scotland had to melt and blend with a nation of "foreigners," and with foreigners her antient, and, as it was then ſaid, her natural enemies. Her wounds were yet green and ſtiff: reciprocal hatreds, alternate triumphs, a frontier deſolated and famous from eternal warfare, and a hiſtory full of nothing but the injuries and invaſions of England, were but little propitious to this new and wiſe deſign. There was much to be forgotten or forgiven—natural jealouſies, old antipathies, national pride and family reſentments, were all to be ſoothed and won over by the evident utility and advantage of the union. Scotland beſides poſſeſſed an actual and efficient independence; ſhe had a real ſovereignty to ſubſcribe and ſurrender to the united parliament; ſhe had a valuable conſideration to contribute for the wealth, the ſecurity and the dignity ſhe received.

and

But is this the caſe of the Iriſh planter? is his independance real, or any thing but a dangerous and deluſive ſound, which tempts him to the rock, and draws him to the whirlpool? Is he independant of France, who pours her avengers upon the land? or independant of three millions of natives, who claim his eſtate with title-deeds and pikes? or independant of England, who defends him with her ſhips, her ſoldiers, and even her militia? Yet Scotland preferred to yield this real independance, ſo dear to her early prejudice. She preferred the ſubſtantial uſeful glory of a common ſceptre and an imperial legiſlature, to the dull privilege of provincial greatneſs and municipal ambition. After centuries of cruel hoſtilities, fruitful of wretchedneſs and glory, ſhe ſubſided into her true and juſt poſition, and incorporated with her mighty neighbour, to whom fate and nature had awarded the ſeat of empire. Now then comes the queſtion of analogy. Has ſhe repented of her prudence, of her true and wiſe magnanimity? Is the Britiſh name leſs glorious than the Scots? Is population, is commerce, is internal peace, a motive for repentance? Are improvement, arts and civilization, or the well-being of life, motives for repentance? Have we violated the treaty—have we impoſed tribute—have we abuſed our imperial power, or betrayed the confidence of the kingdom we united with? If all this experience is loſt and thrown away; if this analogy and contraſt are both ineffectual, I know not what argument can reach the deep-rooted prejudice of Ireland.

If the offer of union therefore cannot be taken as an inſult to our colony; if America has not been much benefited by ſeparation; if Scotland has never charged us with breach of faith or partial exerciſe of dominion over her; if there be upon the face of the earth no condition more glorious, or more happy than that of Britons; and if to extend, participate, and fully communicate all the bleſſings we enjoy, be entitled to ſome commendation and to ſome return, it will not I truſt be too much to expect from the returning good ſenſe and temper of the majority of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, that the diſcuſſion may at leaſt be permitted of this meaſure; the principle of which appears to have ſo many claims to their gratitude.

The queſtion of competency (if that is ſeriouſly a queſtion) is the next in order; and then the general utility and fairneſs of the meaſure itſelf. But it is not my intention, for the preſent at leaſt, to examine the particular merit of every clauſe and condition, which can only be diſcuſſed with any beneficial effect, and I fear, only with any candour, by commiſſioners on both ſides, who ſhall be already ſatisfied of the pure and honourable character of the proceeding, of the competency of the two parliaments, and of the reciprocal advantage, dignity, and ſecurity, which it is their object to procure and confirm to both kingdoms.

As to the queſtion of competency, I ſhall add but one argument to thoſe which have been urged

with

with ſuch reſiſtleſs energy on both ſides of the water; and that, becauſe it is addreſſed to thoſe perſons, whoſe fanciful and dangerous doctrines would unhinge the civilized world; who deny the power of ſtates and governments and legiſlatures, and would aſſemble in plains or foreſts upon every new caſe and occurrence, the population of an empire, to collect the votes of labourers and ſhepherds. I think the abſurdity of their opinion is merged and drowned in its depravity; the bitter malice and ſubtlety of their ſcheme ſwallows up its madneſs and impracticable folly. But I would aſk them upon their own principle, and according to their own reaſoning, what right the Britiſh parliament poſſeſſed in 1782, without conſulting numerically the people of Britain, to ſurrender the ſovereign controul and ſupremacy of the Britiſh legiſlature over their colony in Ireland? What right had Britain to abandon three millions of catholics to the diſcretion of the colony, without the conſent of every ſhop and every cabin in the four provinces? I would aſk them what right the Parliament of Ireland poſſeſſed in 1782, to accept that fatal boon, without conſulting the people of Ireland in the ſame manner? Do they mean to ſay that parliaments are competent when themſelves approve their meaſures, and incompetent when they differ from them? Does the authority of the ſtate, and the exerciſe of the conſtitution, depend upon their approbation or concurrence? or is parliament competent to contract, and not to reſcind a contract—to bind, and not to looſen? Do they

mean

mean to ſay that we had no authority to cede the colonies of America? or that we have no competence to ſever Ireland and abandon it to France? They will not go this length. I know it, but their argument does; for it denies the validity of every legiſlative act, of every great national ſettlement, becauſe the votes of the multitude have not been collected *per capita*. It would neither leave order, government, nor authority in ſtates, nor peace between them; it would revoke into doubt and litigation every act, every treaty, and every principle, by which the conduct of nations has been governed or their misfortunes terminated.

If it is contended that parliaments are competent to procure advantage and general good, but not to part with or alienate them; I ſhall anſwer, that this is a begging of the queſtion; for we aſſert the union to be advantage and general good. But it is not only a begging of the queſtion, but a confuſion of the terms; for competency does not intend, nor conclude, nor reſpect wiſdom. An uſurper has made wiſe and wholeſome laws, and a legal prince abſurd and unjuſt ones: yet the competency is with the legal prince. For competency depends upon a juſt authority, and not upon the uſe of it. This is material for me to ſtate, who am preparing to ſhew, that the act of 1782 (the legality of which who doubts muſt, in my opinion, be very weak or very wicked) was an act very imprudent and very prejudicial to the people of Ireland.

By

By that act, I confeſs I think that the parliaments of the two kingdoms did mean to come to a FINAL SETTLEMENT; though there exiſts great authority to prove that there were ſtateſmen on both ſides the water who ſaw either the danger, the inſufficiency, or the nullity of the act. I think the public of both kingdoms interpreted it in that light, and in that light I think it was condemned, and lamented by every man of feeling, reflexion, and ſagacity.

It was an act extorted by the baſe ingratitude of our Iriſh colony, from the feebleneſs and calamity of our ſtate. It was an act of ambitious violence, impoſed upon us while we lay weltering in our blood, and faint from defeat and diſaſter. It was an act of unfilial and unmanly artifice, plotted by the baſeſt of intriguers, and conceded by the weakeſt of miniſters.

That this, "final ſettlement," was impoſſible to laſt, and that it did not require the miſconduct of the colonial independent parliament upon ſubſequent events, to open men's eyes upon its abſurdity and danger, I am ready to admit; and if the injuſtice or folly of any meaſure could ſhake the competency of the act, I will admit that this might be invalidated for incompetency.

Fortunately, indeed, the independence of the Iriſh colony which it eſtabliſhed, as far as lay within its power, was a nullity and a cypher. But the dependence of the native upon the colony, it did fully create and eſtabliſh—an act of injuſtice, I am ſorry to ſay, which cannot be palliated by

the general conduct of the colony towards him. An act which carried deſpair into the boſom of the catholics, and placed their only hope of emancipation upon the aſſiſtance of foreigners, and the misfortunes of this country.

It ſeems to be the faſhion, to under-rate the capacity and underſtanding of the Roman catholics of Ireland; but though the ignorance and bigotry of the lower claſſes of that perſuaſion are no doubt the cauſe of many exceſſes, and the inſtrument of all, I cannot diſcover that the leaders of it have ſo conducted themſelves, as that we ſhould contemn or look down upon their abilities with any conſcious pride of ſuperiority. They knew that an independent Iriſh parliament —they knew that the repreſentatives of a proteſtant colony, would not and could not dare to truſt the immenſe majority of their nation with an equality of political rights and condition. They ſaw that what they looked for from the power and magnanimity of Britain, became hopeleſs from the hands of ſettlers, whoſe weakneſs made them jealous and afraid. They were too conſcious of their own ſtrength, and too fond of their title, to deſire or expect they ſhould ever be truſted by an uſurper, whoſe force they deſpiſed, and whoſe right they diſputed. They felt themſelves abandoned, and turned over to the generoſity of a handful of proprietors, who were too powerleſs, and too timid to be merciful: and if the independent parliament had been compelled to make the conceſſion, they would have been

too

too ſenſible of the cauſe from which it ſprung; they would have called it fear and not liberality, and they would have ſeized the proffered boon, not as ſatisfaction and content, but as a ſtep in the ladder of their ambition, and an advanced poſt in the march of revenge!

Such I apprehend were the ſentiments of the catholic and the coloniſt towards each other, that there could not be a greater misfortune to the one, or injuſtice to the other, than the removal of that ſupremacy and controul of empire in Britain, which could alone reſpectively maintain and repreſs them. And if I were to contemplate the act of 1782 in no other point of view, and without relation to the internal ſtate of the colony itſelf, I ſhould not heſitate to condemn it, upon this account, as the moſt unjuſt as well as the moſt unwiſe upon the ſtatute book. I confeſs I ſee no means that are leſt us by that act while it remains in force, (and it cannot be reſcinded without the conſent of the Iriſh parliament,) of putting an end to thoſe calamities and crimes that have flowed from it, except in this meaſure of Union alone And if I could be brought to conſider it with leſs diſlike and averſion, it would be becauſe I regard it as having prepared and accelerated that happy and glorious event, by the evils it has accumulated, and by the legal facility it has created.

I ſhall ſhew, before I conclude theſe reflexions, what are the peculiar advantages it offers to the Roman catholic, and upon what motives alone it appears poſſible for him to reject it; at

preſent the courſe of my argument leads me to enquire whether the final ſettlement and independence of 1782 have been more favourable to the Britiſh colony than to the native population.

The perſons who are inclined to think or ſpeak moſt favourably of that act of "final ſettlement," are thoſe who conſider it as an experiment upon the part of Britain, whether her colony, which had ſeldom conducted itſelf with wiſdom, prudence, or juſtice towards the native, being at length entruſted with the entire dominion of the country, and inveſted in the complete legiſlative authority, would be able or willing to deviſe any wiſer or more liberal meaſures for the general government of the people. But beſides that, it is difficult to connect the words *final* and *experiment*; it ſeems more natural, if we are to ſuppoſe any free conſent and foreſight at all, upon the part of England at the cloſe of the laſt diſaſtrous war, to ſuſpect that it was not intended, by the government at leaſt, to ſurrender the imperial rights of the parent country for ever; but to convince the ignorant ambition of the colony of their unfitneſs for empire, and to prepare, as has been already ſtated, their free and formal conſent to their incorporation; while in the mean time it took away from the independent colonial parliament all occaſion and pretext of charging the metropolitan country with any part of their own miſgovernment or inability to govern.

But even this hypotheſis, I confeſs, appears to me violent and improbable, becauſe all the real

and

and effectual change that was operated in the colony by this pretended experiment in the gift of independence, was the mere ſubſtitution of influence in the room of prerogative, and of miniſterial favour for parliamentary controul. The dependance was not, nor could be changed; but the mode and application of the principle were adopted to a new and a worſe poſition, and transferred from the conſtitution to the treaſury. Dependence is the natural and the neceſſary order for every colony that ever was or can be planted, ſo long, at leaſt, as it requires the aid and protection of the parent country; and to give it the name and qualification of independence, while nature and neceſſity forbid the ſubſtance of the thing, is to betray and expoſe it to corruption, and all the baſe and little paſſions of avarice and left-handed ambition. Did the Iriſh colony receive nothing, then, by the act of 1782? Did we confer nothing by this high-ſounding term of independence? Unfortunately we gave a fatal boon, the kindneſs of which will be better conjectured than explained, when we conſider the preſent ſtate of the independent parliament! There are, or there were at the time when the union was firſt propoſed in the Houſe of Commons, one hundred and ſixteen placemen in that Aſſembly, whoſe complete number does not exceed three hundred. I will not comment upon this bluſhing text, nor will I ſearch into the red-book of the civil liſt of Ireland. I wiſh only to be underſtood, and I draw a veil over every thing that can

diſguſt

diſguſt or inflame. The privilege obtained, therefore, was not to be independent, which was impoſſible, but the privilege to be paid for obedience, which was but too eaſy. Prerogative had diſappeared with the ſtatute of George the firſt, and corruption by the law-politic had taken its place. I withdraw my eyes from this filthy ſpectacle; I leave to others to detail a venal peerage, and penſioned lubricity; the Empire of the Cuſtom-houſe, and commiſſions in the army given for ſale to provoſts or to prieſts. But let the colony declare if this be the independence ſhe deſired in 1782? If theſe be the bleſſings ſhe aſpired to? If this is the ſovereignty ſhe affected?

The colony, however, gained other advantages from her independence, of which it is difficult to appreciate the extent and the value. She augmented the number of her abſentees by that portion of her wealthy and ambitious peers and commoners whom ſhe annually deputed to court promotion and emolument in the antichambers of the Treaſury, and the drawing-room of St. James's. She derived an addition to this mighty benefit by the deſpair and revolt of the catholic, which rendered reſidence altogether impoſſible, or converted every ſeat and every park in the iſland into a camp or a garriſon. Theſe were but trifling advantages, however, of her independence, for it was a general, comprehenſive, and pervading power which detached, and looſened, and diſſolved the very cement of her civil ſtate. The tenant became independent of the landlord; the

peaſant

peaſant of the farmer; the child and the wife of the huſband; the individual of the laws, the multitude of the government. It tore the ſubject from the ſtate, from morals, from cuſtoms, from religion; it armed every ſect againſt each other; it invaded the country, and it ſtill invites and provokes invaſion.

Do I deny or palliate the participation of the Engliſh government in the corruptions of the colony? Neceſſity is a plea I will never ſuſtain for fraud or force, for tyranny or ſeduction. But it requires a very ſtern and rigid virtue to reject it altogether here, where the alternatives were ſo dangerous and ſo cruel; for the colony, as I have already ſhewn by her own ingratitude and violence, had extorted from her bleeding parent that Pandora gift; and ſhe continued to abuſe her fatal weakneſs with new demands, and even menaces. But the queſtion is not here to impeach a delinquent, but to ſhew and prove the body of the crime. It is of the guilt, and not the guilty, that we are enquiring; but if we ſhould fix the perſon, and deliver up the criminal, how can this "independent" Parliament proceed or proſecute? At what bar, and before what tribunal can it impeach him? Do you not ſee at every ſtep, how viſionary, how falſe and illuſory is this fatal preſent? This independence, which corrupts and cannot ſave, which betrays and cannot protect, which injures and cannot even avenge?

We hear now, indeed, but for the firſt time, and from thoſe who, till now, have never ceaſed

to

to deplore the wretchedneſs and calamities of the colony, that it has improved and thriven ſince her boaſted acquiſition of independence; or as they affect to call it, in the language of commerce, inſtead of policy, ſince the diſſolution of the partnerſhip. But both their aſſertion and their term are falſe and ill-choſen; for it is eaſy to prove (and it has been proved beyond the power of replication) that ſhe has improved only where the partnerſhip remained and flouriſhed, and that ſhe has decayed and periſhed wherever the connexion has expired, or been ſuſpended. She has improved in induſtry and commerce, becauſe for theſe ſhe remained dependent upon the power, the tutelary care, and generoſity of England. She has thriven only in matters beyond the reach, control, and authority of her independent parliament, and there only, and preciſely ſo far as ſhe has been upheld by the providence and the purſe of England. Can her independent parliament prevent the legiſlature of Britain from repealing the duties ſhe impoſes upon foreign competition, or the bounties ſhe grants on the re-exportation of Iriſh manufactures? or are theſe favours the gift of the parliament of Dublin? The cauſe, therefore, of this proſperity is not independence; and in her political ſtate where indeed ſhe has diſſolved the partnerſhip, and become as independent as I have ſhewn, I ſhould not fear to aſk of Mr. Grattan himſelf, whether ſhe has improved there? If ſhe has—her folly has been proſperous; her corruptions and

her

her misgovernment have been wise and happy Her promises and compromises with the catholic and the dissenter, with emancipation and reform, have been prudent and just; her conspiracies, her insurrections, are fortunate and good. If she has improved in her internal state, it is because rebellion and martial law are advantages, because anarchy and murder are boons from heaven; because rape and massacre, and pillage and fires, and desolation are benefits and blessings to mankind!

Now I would ask, if it be possible to devise a milder or a kinder remedy for all these evils (for as such I am perverse and blind enough to consider them) than that of union with the parent state? With a state, whose manners cannot fail to soften and civilize this wretched and exasperated race? With a state whose power can compress these factions; who has strength to be generous, and courage to be just? The colony has learned in a bloody school the vanity of her ambition; she *feels* that she is not, and cannot be, independant of this sustaining hand, which succours and upholds her. Three millions of natives and catholics forbid it. And though there may be men of ferocious minds, who would exterminate the natives; though I have heard an atrocious policy avowed in the public councils, by which they were to be armed, and let loose upon each other; tho' I have heard the offer of union condemned as a remedy inadequate to the evil, and the salvation of the few asserted to depend upon the extirpation

of the majority; that the catholics muſt be extinguiſhed, and put out; that not a ſingle Rohilla of them all can be left with impunity; though I have heard theſe ſanguinary doctrines pollute the walls of a Houſe of Parliament, I am ſatisfied they are confined to a very few breaſts not wickeder than they are weak. I think the Britiſh miniſtry are entitled to the higheſt praiſe for the candour and the loftineſs of their councils. I think the attempt is worthy of the great and generous nation over which they preſide; and as it appears to me impoſſible to reconcile the native and the ſettler without incorporating the whole, and adopting them both into the virtues, the moderation, and the magnanimity of Britain, I am deſirous of giving to this meaſure of theirs the fulleſt and moſt unqualified applauſe and approbation. Independance is out of the queſtion; it is of the forms of dependance that it is alone important to enquire, and if I knew of any, milder, more liberal, and more beneficial to Ireland than union is, that form of dependance I would prefer and offer for the government of our colony. For it is only when the colony and the natives are united and loſt in each other, that the Anglo-Iriſh will ceaſe to be dependant. It is then that they will fuſe and blend together with the empire at large, and become as independant as Scotland is, or Yorkſhire or Cornwall.

It is with conſiderable pain and diſguſt that I dwell upon thoſe obſtacles to the accompliſhment of this generous plan, which appear to me as the moſt powerful and effective in the minds of our

own

own colony, and of the Roman catholics of Ireland. For as to the motives of the United Iriſhmen, it were abſurd in their oppoſition to ſeek for any, but their love of anarchy and confuſion, their project of pillage and revolution, and their devotedneſs to any cauſe and any power that can protract the miſeries and convulſions of their country. To ſearch for political objects in the boſoms of conſpirators who have none but to prolong their crimes, and procraſtinate their puniſhment; who ſeek in revolt revolt only, and in evil evil, is to put men's reaſon to a harder taſk than is neceſſary or practicable with ſucceſs.

Certainly it would not be poſſible for any great part of the Britiſh ſettlers in Ireland to prefer their preſent ſtate of anxiety and ſuffering to the plan of union and incorporation that is held out to them, unleſs there lingered in their mind ſome hope or longing after another iſſue of their preſent difficulties and evils. It is the Jacobin of nature only, that delights in the continuation of the preſent wretchedneſs; but I am afraid there is a Jacobiniſm of policy, which induces ſome men to bear with or prolong evils ſuſceptible of an earlier termination, in the hope of more advantage to themſelves, or greater triumph in the iſſue. I confeſs I fear that there are amongſt our ſettlers in Ireland ſome unrelenting minds who expect and prefer another concluſion of the conteſt, and very different from ours; the horrible principle which has been diſcloſed even in England, induces me very ſtrongly to apprehend, that there is no obſtacle in

a part of the colony more hoſtile and formidable to the projected UNION, than the hope of being enabled by the arms and treaſure of the mother-country to obtain ſuch decided and definitive ſucceſs in the civil war, as to enable their "Independant Parliament" to attaint and confiſcate the remaining part of the property of Ireland not actually in the occupation of that colony.

I know this ungenerous and ſanguinary ſentiment is partial and limited indeed; and I truſt the executive and paramount authority indefeaſible in England, though no longer legally exiſting in its legiſlature, will never ſanction this atrocious and premeditated ſcheme of inſatiable avarice, and unneceſſary revenge. For it is abſolutely impoſſible to ſuggeſt upon what ground their private avarice can be recommended as a national and public ſcheme, or by what motives our colony will attempt to induce us to purchaſe for them through ſeas of guilt and blood, this cruel advantage, of treading out the native Iriſh, and becoming, in a very new and different ſenſe, "independant" of ourſelves. I confeſs I do not think they have ſo uſed the nominal and fictitious independance they enjoyed, as that by any ſound and rational policy we could be authorized to concede a more real and effective ſeparation.

If the only obſtacle to union in the boſom of our colony is this criminal and flagitious hope of deriving from our victories an unjuſt and miſerable ſucceſs of ſlavery and plunder, I am fearful that it is impoſſible to aſſign, after every allowance

for

for paſſion and for prejudice, a better or a more pardonable plea for the refuſal or the ſilence of the catholic. Revenge, and the hope of prey, are his undiſguiſed motives; and he is only ſo far leſs abſurd or leſs guilty than the coloniſt I have deſcribed, as he believes himſelf to have a right, according to the doctrines of impreſcriptibility, to poſſeſs the lands, which no time, no length of poſſeſſion can alienate, no acquieſcence transfer; and as he relies for his hope of ſucceſs upon a government, which as it were from the very center and focus of robbery, adopts and aſſiſts every ſyſtem, and every ſpecies of plunder, every attack upon every poſſeſſion, every innovation of right and principle, and law and property.

I think neither of theſe hopes will be crowned with ſucceſs, becauſe the Britiſh government will never eſpouſe the crime of the coloniſt, and becauſe the French directory will never be able to gratify the vengeance and the avarice of the catholic. The catholic republic may ſound well in the ears of inebriated rebels, whoſe crimes have cut them off from their country as long as it ſhall be adminiſtered under any form of government, under any order whatſoever. It may ſound well and lofty in the ears of ignorant and inflated conſpirators, and the abſurdity and ſoleciſm of the term itſelf may not be diſcovered by minds confounded by their terrors, and furious from their crimes.

The '*Catholic Republic?*' at another time I ſhould be tempted to aſk how a catholic republic could exiſt, or how could it be projected by men, who in all

all their dreams of innovation and reform have had no viſion of a preſbyterian monarchy, or a democratical nobility. The '*Catholic Republic*?' and what is to become of the hierarchy? what of indefeaſible ſucceſſion? But this abſurd and contradictory term may teach us ſomething; it betrays the meaſure of their capacity for whom it is deſigned; it ſhows how low, how ignorant, how obtuſe is the dupe, how mean the victim, the prieſts of anarchy prepare. A catholic republic! what? by the ſide, and under the wing of a republic of atheiſts? A catholic republic guaranteed by the ex-biſhop Talleyrand, and the doating theo-philanthropiſt Lepeau? What! will the titular biſhops of Ireland, will men of learning, humanity, and piety, do homage to the ſee of infidelity, and receive the ring and the croſier from the apoſtate Syeyes, or from Ali-Buonaparte? Do they not ſee this catholic republic is a republic of chairmen and fruit-pickers? That it is the deſpotiſm of ignorance and ſtrength, of brutal vices, and of numbers? That it is the downfall of all religion, and of all order and gradation, the pillage of property, and the firſt half only of a revolution?

Surely the virtuous catholic will prefer even the exiſting order, and the exiſting oppreſſions, to this ſpecies of emancipation and liberty. He will not trample on the croſs of Chriſt, for a licenſe to trade in municipalities and departments: he will not deny or abjure his faith, to traffic in anarchy and republics; and he will rather try at leaſt this new and kinder order, this chriſtian union, by which he is called into the free privileges of an Engliſhman,

and

and placed by the ſide of a ſiſter and a tolerating church.

It is impoſſible to ſuppoſe that a greater duty can ever be laid upon men, than what has now fallen upon the ſincere and enlightened catholic of Ireland. He has revenge and hopes of intereſt to ſacrifice in the cauſe of God and man; but revenge is almoſt ſatiated in ſeas of civil blood, and his hope of civil advantage, is the pillage of a wreck in which he runs the common danger—He has early prejudices to conquer; but adverſity is a great teacher, and the wholeſome leſſons of calamity ſtill vibrate on his ear—a great change is propounded to him, and he is called to the rights of citizenſhip, not by the deſperate cry of infidels and regicides, but by the free, ſpontaneous, and liberal voice of a great and chriſtian kingdom, ſpeaking his own language, governed by the ſame laws, having the ſame intereſts, the ſame mutual relations, the ſame endearing bonds, the ſame defence, and the ſame neceſſity—by a kingdom to which he is united by the natural order before the political, and by the diviſion of the globe itſelf, before the civil inventions and relations of ſociety.

His duty and his real intereſt, I think it cannot be denied, are evident upon the ſame ſide. His religion is not leſs threatened than the ſtate and property of the colony. Will he ſuffer the proteſtant to take the lead, and to do that for his temporal good, which he himſelf ſhall neglect or oppoſe, though for his eternal good? Will he delay to undeceive an ignorant population, that look up to him

for

for inſtruction and example? Will he defer to unfurl the ſacred banner, and to call back the deluded rebel from the colours of Infidelity? Will he refuſe to tell him that he is deceived and miſled, and that the ſole danger he ought to apprehend to his religion, is from his infidel allies, from his impious confederates, the perſecutors of God and man, who have ſworn to extirpate it from the earth, and cruſh the croſs to duſt?

If any well-diſpoſed and enlightened Iriſhman, of either religion, is averſe to the Union, I think it is incumbent upon him to ſhew, either that the preſent order of things is good and deſirable in itſelf, or elſe that it is capable of modification and amendment. But theſe are taſks I am confident no ſuch perſon will undertake; the firſt, becauſe the direct converſe is palpable and confeſſed; and the ſecond, becauſe the conſpirators themſelves have declared upon oath, and in contemplation of death, that no modification or change, no reform or emancipation, will ſatisfy or appeaſe them. Their fanaticiſm is of a higher order; they will accept of nothing but this very catholic republic, under the protection of the atheiſt republic; and to be a free and imperial part of a chriſtian empire, neither meets their devotion, nor gratifies their ambition.

Another reaſon why ſuch a perſon will not ſupport the argument of modification, is this: becauſe he knows the unhappy victims of the refined malice of republican atheiſm are led away, not by the hope or wiſh of reform or emancipation, but by ſuggeſtions that their religion is in danger; becauſe he knows

the cruel power of artifice and deſign upon the devout and agitated boſom of poor and honeſt ignorance, ſacrificing all things, ſuffering all things, and daring all things in the cauſe ſuppoſed of religion.

I am not often tempted to uſe hard words; but if ever there was a deviliſh artifice on the earth; if ever there were any wickedneſs more near and natural to hell itſelf than other crimes and atrocities, it is this foul, unrelenting, common mockery of both perſuaſions, this cruel ſacrifice of chriſtian blood, by the inſtigation and malice of infidelity. It is the arming of religious ſects at the bidding of impiety; it is the maſſacre of chriſtians by the practice of atheiſts.

That this order therefore can never ſtand is made certain, by the hatreds it engenders, by the factions that attack it, by the conviction itſelf of its approaching fall. But that the precarious and partial connexion between the two iſlands cannot laſt upon the preſent footing, is not ſo clearly deducible, from the experience of the paſt, from the debates in Ireland upon war and peace, and the ſeparating policy of its parliament in the regency bills; as from the nature of the thing itſelf, and the real, neceſſary, and indefeaſible dependance of Ireland, in ſpite of the legal and formal independence. The preſent order is at war with the order of nature, and the law of neceſſity; and whether it ſhall be overthrown or not by a ſeparate regency, or by contradictory votes upon peace and war, it only exiſts at all by being conſtantly evaded, and in exact proportion to the violence it receives.

In times of tranquillity, (if one might dream of thoſe) it muſt be tamed by corruption into the controul and obedience of England: in war it muſt either partake of force in the dangers of England, or be ſubdued by her as her firſt and moſt dangerous enemy. It is ſuſpended altogether by the preſent divided ſtate, and the coloniſts having thrown themſelves into the arms of their parent country, for protection againſt France, and againſt the nation where they have ſettled, have fully proved how impoſſible is the reality of independence, and how dangerous the illuſion.

That the preſent order cannot laſt, and ought not to be re-eſtabliſhed, ariſes alſo out of the ſtate, dangers, and neceſſities of England herſelf. It is impoſſible for her to adopt as any part of a ſettled and permanent policy, the protection of her colony under the preſent circumſtances, and to affect to hold her up in every danger, commotion, and general inſurrection, to which this fatal ſyſtem expoſes her. It were better for England that her colony, and the whole iſland of Ireland were precipitated to the bottom of the ocean, than that they ſhould remain to her the charge, the danger and the diſtraction they have been, in a war in which ſhe poſſeſſed no hope of eſcape or victory, no chance of ſalvation, but Unanimity. It were better Ireland were blotted from the map, and expunged from the liſt of nations, than that ſhe ſhould remain this diverſion of our power and force, this arſenal of attack and injury, this ſource of danger and annoyance, and this devouring gulph of our blood and reſources.

It reſults clearly, and beyond the power of equivocation to contradict or evade, that if the ſettlement of 1782 were final, if it were meant and deſigned not only, as I think it was, by the two parliaments who contracted, but by the miniſters who planned it, as a definitive ſettlement; I ſay, it reſults clearly in point of fact, that the miniſters and the parliaments have been deceived; that it has not proved what they intended; that it has not produced the effect they had in contemplation; and that they did one thing, while they ſtipulated another. Inſtead of a final ſettlement, they procured eternal feuds and rebellion—inſtead of independance, a corrupt dependance—inſtead of imperial identity, diſtinct regencies and contradictory titles in the crown itſelf, with diſcuſſions upon war and peace—inſtead of content, commotion—inſtead of order, treaſon—inſtead of gratitude and affection, and tranquillity, foreign counſels, bloody conſpiracies, and general inſurrection.

What then are theſe final contracts, which no miſtake nor error, no repentance nor experience of ill can looſen or unbind? What are the grants, which neither deception in the giver, nor injury to the endowed, can defeat or avoid? Shall an improper grant of the crown be ſet aſide in the courts of law for want of the preſumed information in the ſovereign, and an act of ſtate, in which nations are deceived and miſled, be perpetual, in ſpite of experiment and remorſe? Are the people of Ireland maſſacred and ſtarved? Is England exhauſted, and expoſed to every wound of war and inſurrection,

and yet we muſt ſtand to the condition? We muſt inherit, in ſpite of our own diſclaim; we muſt take unwilling, the benefit of the entail, and enjoy the fee-ſimple of our calamities? Would I break then the treaty we have ſigned? Would I violate the faith of parliament? Would I reſume the control we have abandoned, and the independence to which we have ſubſcribed? I would *not* do it; becauſe we can do better, becauſe we can incorporate and admit Ireland into our own imperial ſtate; becauſe we can advance inſtead of receding; becauſe we can confer advantages, and privileges, and ſafety, and perfect liberty, inſtead of returning to the crude ſtate of colony and metropolis—becauſe, inſtead of dependence and protection, we can offer Union and identity of power and ſtate; inſtead of inferiority, participation; inſtead of humiliation, glory. But would I do it in any caſe. and under any circumſtances? It is not left to do—it is done already by neceſſity, and the nature of things themſelves, which parchments cannot alter. But I would do it. By what law? By what right? Not for error, not for incompetence—but by that law which Heaven itſelf has ordained, that the ſafety of the people ſhould be the law ſupreme; by that eternal paramount authority, by which every lawful conſtitution, under every form and name of human ſociety, holds at every moment, the full, abſolute, entire, and perfect ſovereign right, (with its correſpondent duty) to redreſs every evil, to provide for every emergency, to defend the people from every danger, and to ſuccour them under every calamity.

The

The more I examine the ancient policy and conduct of England, with regard to Ireland, I beg leave to repeat it, the more kind and generous I find it towards the colony, and I think her only real reproach has been, neglect of the natives: even now, that the misgovernment and misfortunes of the colony seem, perhaps, to call for acts of rigor and forfeiture; what is the conduct of the parent state, and what the language she holds to her libertine? Does she resume her charters? Does she cancel her grants? Does she revoke the independence he has extorted from her, or place him in a state of pupilage again? No. She intreats with maternal fondness to draw closer, for the common benefit and safety, those bonds, which have always knit them together in interest and affection. She desires but to confirm and strengthen that REAL UNION, which has always subsisted between them, in spite of political names, and legal distinctions. She wishes to protect him still, but with more efficacy and vigor, and to be able to extend her beneficence to three millions of wretched natives, whom he cannot oppress but with her arms, nor deliver but with his own ruin. But what are the terms of this protection, and what the price she sets upon her beneficence? Is it the surrender of territory? Is it taxation? Is it the abandonment of any good, or of any power? America complained that she was taxed without representation, but Ireland is invited to send an hundred commoners, and an equal proportion of her peers. But is not this number adequate and sufficient? Scotland, with more than double the population

lation of the colony (for the native is not yet repreſented at all) has never made this complaint. She has never complained of any combination of the Engliſh majority to oppreſs her counties, or ſuſpected ſuch an injury, more than Yorkſhire or Cornwall. She has never complained that her people did not enjoy their full proportion of public office, emolument, and power, and of the favours and countenance of the crown. Her influence in the Britiſh cabinet, on the contrary, has been the burthen of Engliſh jealouſy, the theme of conſtant invective, and ſometimes of deep and ſerious accuſation. But England has never been accuſed, by the blackeſt malice of irritated recrimination, of the leaſt injuſtice, unkindneſs, or prejudice, againſt the united kingdom. What juſt, or rather what poſſible reaſon is there for Ireland to apprehend, againſt the experience of a whole century? Were the thoughts of England hoſtile and deſigning, ſhe would not preſent this Union. She would ſay to her colony—You have abuſed and miſgoverned, and are incapable to govern, and therefore your power is forfeited, and your right reverted;—you have been a bad maſter, I cancel your authority;—you have been a bad child, and I diſinherit you. This would be the language of the angry parent.—Let us liſten to her accents:—"Let us govern together." Is that cruel, or oppreſſive, or unjuſt? "Come and take your ſeat in my council and my ſenate:" Is that hard or unnatural? "Come, and let us conſult together for the common cauſe in the imperial ſenate of both iſlands; depute your portion of wiſdom and virtue; take your

your ſhare in the general adminiſtration;" Is this partial, or excluſive, or ungenerous?

Is it ungenerous in England, to give this end to the local calamities of Ireland, and call her to the full participation of Britiſh bleſſings? Is it ungenerous to take her ſhare in the crimes, and accuſe herſelf of the miſgovernment of her colony? and inſtead of taxing it with ingratitude, to blame her own prepoſterous indulgence, and that fatal weakneſs, which miſled and deceived it? which granted a boon it was not able to receive, and expoſed it to ſeductions and perils beyond its ſtrength to combat, or its power to repel? What is there in all this conduct injurious or over-bearing? Is there any inſult, as a part of the parliament of Ireland thought, in offering the condition of Britons, and the participation of empire to our own colony? Is there any inſult or any injury in offering it to the deſcendants of thoſe natives, who have always been oppreſſed by our colony, and done homage to our crown? It is not a French incorporation, it is not a republican fraternity that Britain offers. She does not take their magiſtrates as hoſtages, nor impoſe contributions, nor drag away the youth of the kingdom in fetters and chains, by military requiſitions. She does not enthrone mechanics and felons in the government, in order to govern it. She does not throw down the altars and erect impiety. She does not ordain licentiouſneſs and terror. What, I aſk of any honeſt coloniſt, what is it you are afraid of? —Of being independent, who have only the name and miſerable mockery of independance? of being in tranquillity, who are torn and tortured with civil

vil wars and hoſtile invaſions? of ſeeing the condition of the catholic by degrees ameliorated and improved, who have no hope of a momentary reprieve and ſafety, but in granting him a complete emancipation? of ſeeing your abſentees encreaſe, whoſe troubles have cauſed an hoſt of emigration, which can never return into your boſom but with Union, and as a conſequence of Union? of ſeeing your repreſentatives dependent upon the imperial cabinet of the united realms, who have now in your repreſentative body one hundred and ſixteen placemen, with threeſcore and ten aſpirants of the law, and with all this a factious ariſtocracy, which outweighs even your corruption? of ſeeing your induſtry and your trade decline, whoſe induſtry is turned to the forging of pikes and the lopping of trees, and the maiming of cattle, and the murdering of men, and who owe all your trade to Britiſh conſumption, and Britiſh bounties?

To the catholics of Ireland, I think Britain does not addreſs a leſs kind or leſs generous language. She does not tell them—"You are incorrigible rebels, whom no time can ſoften, no kindneſs can ſubdue:" but ſhe invites them to ſuch an order, as will comport with kindneſs, and permit her, without cruelty to her colony, to place them on the ſame footing with the beſt and faithfulleſt of her ſubjects: as will melt and obliterate all memory, and rancour, all invidious diſtinctions, all civil and political difference. Of the candid catholic, I will aſk once more, if he expects emancipation, and a full participation of power and ſituation from the colony?

colony? If he expects it from the united monsters that deface his country, and have sworn that they will not accept emancipation? If he expects the catholic republic from the atheist usurpers of France, who have overthrown the religion and the republic of their own country, and overthrown every religion and every republic, wherever their crimes or their arms have led them?

If he expects emancipation from the parliament of Dublin, I will ask him if a handful of men can emancipate a multitude? If an armed regiment will liberate a disarmed host? It is a mystery not very profound, that fear is a coward, that weakness cannot confide, and that injury never pardons. I will tell him plainly, the parliament of Ireland *dares* not to set him free. It is the imperial parliament; It is the power, greatness, and superiority of England which alone can break his chains, or contain him in the first transports of liberty. It is the preponderance, the invulnerable greatness of England, which enables her to be generous, and permits her magnanimity. Will he refuse the boon at the end of six centuries of calamity, of fruitless struggles, and tenacious oppression? Will he confirm and fortify the oath of reprieved or expiring traitors, that it is not liberty, but revenge, and plunder, and revolution, that he fights for? that it is the property and the blood of the English settler for which he thirsts? Will he give this cruel right, this active cause of tyranny to the colony, after he has abjured the mercy and the interference of the metropolis?

Surely, for ourſelves at leaſt, it is more juſt and wiſe, that we ſhould eſſay to quench theſe interminable quarrels, and extinguiſh theſe ever-ſpringing evils, in UNION.—Surely, as an experiment alone, it is better, both for the ſettler and the native, than the prolongation of ſo many crimes and calamities. —I truſt it will be *tried*, before we decide once more to follow our victorious arms with bills of confiſcation and attainder—I truſt it will be tried, and that the act of Union will be an act alſo of amneſty and forgiveneſs. Since it is clear, *de facto*, that our colony is ſtill dependent upon us, I truſt we ſhall not aid nor permit her to repeat thoſe acts with which ſhe has not bluſhed to reproach us.—I truſt it will be tried, not only becauſe it is innocent and merciful, but becauſe it is politic and wiſe. For confiſcation has been too often tried, and it has failed too often; but Union is a new and hopeful meaſure. In Scotland it has ſucceeded under other auſpices, and triumphed over other obſtacles. It was then a mere ſpeculation, but it now furniſhes experience: it was there choice, but here it is neceſſity. I ſay neceſſity, becauſe the alternative that remains is ſuch as nature ſickens at, as humanity rejects, as inſtinct flies from: becauſe it is rebellion, and military government; becauſe it is impriſonment, and torture, and ſudden execution; becauſe it is armed proſecutors and juries of ſoldiers, with their ſerjeants learned in the law; becauſe it is the curfew, and the paſſport-bill; becauſe it is invaſion, maſſacre, and rape, and pillage, and conflagration; becauſe it is the wretch-

edeſt

edeſt and moſt degrading condition of humanity, the moſt diſguſting ſeries of miſery and guilt, the blackeſt and moſt lengthened ſcene and proceſſion of crimes and ſufferings that ever humbled or afflicted man!

It has been ſaid, that the colonial parliament is able and reſolved to provide a remedy for all theſe evils: that they have turned their eyes at laſt to the barbariſm of the people, and to the defects and dangers of their conſtitution. That they have diſcuſſed a regency-bill, and are preparing a national inſtitute for the education of the people. But when have they done ſo? In March 1759. After they have rejected the Union, they are at laſt ſenſible that ſomething is wanting to ſecure the Britiſh *connexion*, and to render the condition of the native tolerable. But are theſe remedies, or only confeſſions of the diſeaſe? what hope of a cure is there for him, who refuſes the ſpecific, and truſts his chronic to palliatives and delay? I wiſh to bring this point to the moſt direct and cleareſt iſſue. If the parliament of Dublin can emancipate the catholics, and thinks emancipation prudent and ſecure under the preſent precarious connexion with Great Britain; if the parliament of Dublin dares to admit the native to equal rights, and a participation of the independant legiſlature, then let them reject the Union, and try their own expedient. But I conſider every man who does reject it, to ſtand in this dilemma. Either he muſt declare for emancipation, or declare that he is contented with the preſent condition of his country. Either he muſt

admit the immenſe majority of the Iriſh into the independant parliament, or he muſt prove, that the independant parliament is competent and able to govern the immenſe unrepreſented majority, and does govern it, with tranquillity, content, and ſucceſs. But is it not both more prudent and more natural, for this independant parliament to melt into the imperial, than to receive the Catholic parliament? Is not its independance more likely to ſurvive its fuſion with the parent ſtate, and in the arms and boſom of Great Britain, than when its doors are open to the Catholic majority, and its power divided with three millions of malcontents?

The Catholic enemy to the union I imagine to ſtand in another dilemma of equal difficulty. He muſt declare that he expects ſomewhat better than emancipation, or that he expects emancipation from a different quarter. And though he ſhould be aſhamed to make this criminal confeſſion, it will not the leſs reſu't from his ſilence and affected neutrality:—nay, it will not the leſs reſult from the denial, or the diſbelief of his own ſentiments. Unhappily for men, their paſſions keep ſecrets from their heart, or their heart dares not reveal, or ſubmit them to the examination of the mind.

After having diſcuſed ſo minutely the motives intereſts, and relative ſituation of the colony and the catholic, it might be liable to miſconſtruction if I were to take no further notice than I have done incidentally, of thoſe clubs and conſpiracies, and of that inviſible empire exerciſed in Ireland,

land by means of filiation and correſpondence, and ſecret oaths, more particularly as theſe treaſons and dangers have reached our own ſtate, and pervaded to the very heart and metropolis of the empire. Yet I think a little reflexion will ſuffice to ſhew, that they are not entitled to much conſideration in this place; and that in referring them to the general condition and calamity of Ireland, I have confined them to their proper ſituation and importance. For certainly the catholic and the colony, the native and the ſettler, are reſpectively entitled to our care and protection. They are the matter of legiſlation, and the objects of policy and juſtice; they compoſe the civil ſtate. To reconcile their intereſts, to adjuſt their differences, and to render them happy and contented with their condition, is the duty no leſs than it is the object of government. But what ſtate or form of government can admit of jacobiniſm as an element of its conſtitution? We blend democracy; we blend nobility; we blend monarchy. But to admit hoſtility to all government, and to every ſtate, to all power, and order, and authority, to every claſs and every form of the adminiſtration of human affairs, as a quality or component part of a regulated ſociety; or to admit the revolutionary principle as we admit and regulate the three powers of which our conſtitution is compounded, were of all errors the moſt fatal and unwiſe. I have, therefore, thrown it out altogether, and conſider it not as a limb, or part of the body politic, but as an ulcer and a plague. I think

the

the jacobin will neither be contented nor ſubdued by the Union, nor in the defeat of the Union; but that he muſt be ſubdued by the execution of the laws, and hunted down by the magiſtrate wherever he is found. To offer him a government who is the ſworn enemy of governments; or a conſtitution, who hates all conſtitutions: to admit into the ſtate the common conſpirator againſt every inſtitution and every form, is tomake peace with tygers, and treaties with Frenchmen. Whether, therefore, there ſhall be Union, or a prolongation of the preſent calamities, the United Iriſhmen will remain alike to be put down, or to be put out by the colonial parliament, or by the imperial.

In this point of view there is but one queſtion, —Which is the moſt powerful and moſt likely to put him down? and as that, which I confeſs appears to me (under the preſent circumſtances of both countries, and of all countries in the world) to be paramount and pre-eminent above every other, I addreſs it with confidence neither to the colony nor to the catholic, but to both, and to every virtuous and reflecting mind of both perſuaſions, and in both kingdoms.

London, April,
1799.

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM 17 53 SEP